

REMARKS

In regard to the Examiner's response to arguments and the statements contained therein, Applicants respectfully submits that the specification and drawings actually describe switching circuitry provided for selectively applying one of an output from the pulse generator, a fixed voltage level, or a floating output and that the previously presented arguments are not erroneous. More importantly, in regard to the Examiner's rejection of claims 1 and 6 under 35 USC-section 112, first paragraph, and the Examiner's allegations concerning new matter issues, the Examiner has asserted that there is no teaching or suggestion concerning switching circuitry that is the combination of the switching circuits of Figure 2 A and 2 B. Applicants respectfully submits that it is the Examiner's remarks which are erroneous.

In particular, Applicants note that the specification at page 9 in the second full paragraph specifically states that:

"It is made possible to select the driving pulses $\Phi 1$ and $\Phi 2$ a predetermined voltage or a floating level to be supplied to the CCD analog shift register 2 by providing the switch circuits SW1 and SW 2 between the terminals of the driving pulses $\Phi 1$ and $\Phi 2$ and the CCD analog shift register as shown in Figure 1."

It is apparent that the Examiner has taken the position that the circuitry described in the Figure 2A is the switch SW1 and the circuitry of Figure 2B is the switch SW2. However, in reading the entire specification it is apparent that the those of ordinary skill in the art readily understand that the switching circuitry can be considered either one or both of these

individual structures and that in the preferred exemplary embodiment, the only reasonable interpretation is that both circuits are preferably though not necessarily used for the switching circuitry referenced SW1 and SW2.

This is due to the fact that the specification explicitly states that "In the following explanation, although a switch circuit SW1 is taken as an example, a switch circuit SW2 has the same constitution as that of the switch circuit SW1. See specifically the disclosure in the top 4 lines of page 8. The specification further notes that the Figures 2A and 2 B show circuit diagrams for explaining the switch circuit. (Emphasis added-Applicants specification at page 8 lines 5-9). Accordingly, the only reasonable interpretation is that the switch circuit SW1 or SW2 are preferably comprised of both portions illustrated in Figures 2A and 2 B. Those skilled in the art will also appreciate that it is not necessary to use both portions and that either one will suffice depending upon the desired flexibility and changes in the applied pulse signal levels.

In any event Applicants respectfully submit that the earlier remarks are not erroneous and furthermore that there is more than ample support in the specification for Applicants claimed invention wherein pulse signals are replaced preferably with either fixed or floating levels.

In regard to the Examiner's objections to claims 2 and 5, Applicants have modified the claims in order to overcome the Examiner's objections. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw these objections. In regard to the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Applicants submit that the foregoing remarks regarding the written description

Appl. No. 09/306,813
Amdt. Dated July 9, 2005
Reply to Office Action of January 11, 2005

issue overcome these rejections. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections set forth under section 112.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the prior art rejection set forth by the Examiner under 35 US C-sections 102 and 103. Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art references of record, whether considered alone, or in combination, fail to either teach or suggest Applicants presently claimed invention. In accordance with Applicants' claimed invention, at least one pulse signal is replaced with a fixed voltage level or a floating level. At best, the Endo reference describes replacing a pulse signal with a fixed level. There is simply no teaching or suggestion whatsoever regarding the replacement of a pulse signal with a floating level or a system or method wherein a single pulse signal may be replaced with either a fixed level or a floating level.

Specifically in regard to the Examiner's assertions concerning the switching to the floating level, Applicants note that the asserted floating level Pe and Pf is actually an offset and not a floating output. See specifically the no reference at Colum 9 lines 28-35. In order to highlight these distinctions, Applicants have added claims to reference systems wherein there are two pulse signal inputs that have been replaced with floating levels and wherein there is one pulse signal replaced with a fixed voltage level and one replaced with a floating level. Additionally, applicant has modified claim 6 in order to highlight the distinctions of the invention

Appl. No. 09/306,813
Amdt. Dated July 9, 2005
Reply to Office Action of January 11, 2005

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims now stand in condition for allowance.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 20-1495.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

7/11/05


Robert J. Depke

(Reg. #37,607)

Trexler, Bushnell, Giangiorgi, Blackstone & Marr
105 West Adams Street, 36th Floor
Chicago, IL 60603
Tel: 312-704-1890
Attorney for Applicant